



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,838	07/25/2003	Masao Misumi	008312-0305241	9258
909	7590	10/13/2005	EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 MCLEAN, VA 22102			RIES, LAURIE ANNE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/626,838

Applicant(s)

MISUMI, MASAO

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/25/03.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-12 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita (U.S. Patent 6,650,343 B1) in view of Wykes ("Pure JavaScript").

As per claims 1, 7, and 9, Fujita discloses a display apparatus, network system, and method including changing the displayed image to a link (See Fujita, Claim 6, Column 2, lines 23-33, and Column 8, lines 15-21). Fujita does not disclose expressly that a script performs the method. It is well known in the art that scripting languages, such as Javascript, can be used to create rollover buttons that change the display when a user rolls over a linked image (See Wykes, second page, paragraph 3). Fujita and Wykes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating markup language data on a display. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a JavaScript function, such as a rollover, to perform the method disclosed by Fujita. The motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the capabilities of a Web page by creating a more professional look (See Wykes, second page, paragraph 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2176

combine Wykes with Fujita for the benefit of enhancing the capabilities of a Web page by creating a more professional look to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 7, and 9.

As per claim 2, Fujita and Wykes disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Fujita also discloses designating an arbitrary link destination from a number of link destinations (See Fujita, Column 8, lines 43-60).

As per claim 10, Fujita and Wykes disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Fujita also discloses managing, as data of the web page, only image data of the web page and sending it to the client (See Fujita, Figure 4, and Column 17, lines 37-40).

2. Claims 3-6, 8, 11-14, and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita (U.S. Patent 6,650,343 B1) in view of Wykes ("Pure JavaScript") as applied to claims 1, 7, and 9 above, and further in view of Hayashi (U.S. Patent 6,477,526 B2).

As per claims 3-5, 8, and 11-12, Fujita and Wykes disclose the limitations of claims 1, 7 and 9 above. Fujita and Wykes do not disclose expressly acquiring image data of an initial screen and display data of a change button designating a link of a displayed image of the Web page, where the change button has one or more buttons designating a link destination of at least any one of "forward", "backward", "left", or "right", provided around a display area of the initial and link destination images.

Hayashi discloses acquiring an initial image and including a portion of the screen used to control the image data, including a button for scrolling the image left and right (See Hayashi, Figure 3, and Column 6, lines 15-19). Fujita, Wykes and Hayashi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating markup language data on a display. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the control portion screen of Hayashi with the system and method of Fujita and Wykes. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to manipulate the images, such as displaying a different portion of the image or another image in sequence (See Hayashi, Column 6, lines 20-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hayashi with Fujita and Wykes for the benefit of allowing the user to manipulate the images, such as displaying a different portion of the image or another image in sequence to obtain the invention as specified in claims 3-5, 8, and 11-12.

As per claim 6, Fujita, Wykes and Hayashi disclose the limitations of claim 3 as described above. Fujita also discloses acquiring the image data of the web page by several linked images (See Fujita Figure 11, and Column 23, lines 21-36).

As per claims 13 and 14, Fujita discloses a terminal device for acquiring data of a web page via a network and displaying an image of the web page including acquiring data of an operation screen that designates a link destination of the displayed image, and changing the displayed image to the link destination (See Fujita, Claim 6, Column 2, lines 23-37, and Column 8, lines 15-21). Fujita does not disclose expressly that a script performs the method. It is well known in the art that scripting languages, such as

Art Unit: 2176

Javascript, can be used to create rollover buttons that change the display when a user rolls over a linked image (See Wykes, second page, paragraph 3). Fujita and Wykes Hayashi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating markup language data on a display. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a JavaScript function, such as a rollover, to perform the method disclosed by Fujita. The motivation for doing so would have been to enhance the capabilities of a Web page by creating a more professional look (See Wykes, second page, paragraph 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wykes with Fujita for the benefit of enhancing the capabilities of a Web page by creating a more professional look to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13 and 14. Fujita also does not disclose expressly that the operation controls are contained on a screen and used to display the image. Hayashi discloses operation controls, such as scroll buttons and the like, contained on an operation screen (See Hayashi, Figure 3). Fujita, Wykes and Hayashi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating markup language data on a display. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the control screen of Hayashi with the terminal device of Fujita and Wykes. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to click on the control buttons to manipulate the image (See Hayashi, Column 6, lines 20-39). Therefore, it would have also been obvious to combine Hayashi with Wykes and Fujita for the benefit of allow the user to click on the control buttons to manipulate the image to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13 and 14.

As per claims 16 and 17, Fujita, Wykes and Hayashi disclose the limitations of claim 13 above. Hayashi also discloses acquiring an initial image and including a portion of the screen used to control the image data, including a button for scrolling the image left and right (See Hayashi, Figure 3, and Column 6, lines 15-19). Fujita, Wykes and Hayashi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating markup language data on a display. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the control portion screen of Hayashi with the system and method of Fujita, Wykes and Hayashi. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to manipulate the images, such as displaying a different portion of the image or another image in sequence (See Hayashi, Column 6, lines 20-39). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hayashi with Fujita, Wykes and Hayashi for the benefit of allowing the user to manipulate the images, such as displaying a different portion of the image or another image in sequence to obtain the invention as specified in claims 16 and 17.

3. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita in view of Hayashi.

As per claim 15, Fujita discloses a terminal device including acquiring data of a linked image in units of several images via a network (See Fujita, Figure 11, and Column 23, lines 21-26), displaying the image in units of one image on the basis of the data acquired (See Fujita, Figure 11, and Column 23, lines 21-36), determining a link

Art Unit: 2176

destination of the image (See Fujita, Column 23, lines 37-64), determining whether or not the link destination of the image is data of the image already acquired (See Fujita, Column 24, lines 34-65), and, when it is determined that the link destination is data of the image already acquired, reflecting the determination result on the display and, when it is determined that the link destination is not data of the image acquired, reflecting the determination result on the display (See Fujita, Column 24, lines 43-65). Fujita does not disclose expressly that the operation controls are contained on a screen and used to display the image. Hayashi discloses operation controls, such as scroll buttons and the like, contained on an operation screen (See Hayashi, Figure 3). Fujita and Hayashi are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of manipulating markup language data on a display. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the control screen of Hayashi with the terminal device of Fujita. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to click on the control buttons to manipulate the image (See Hayashi, Column 6, lines 20-39). Therefore, it would have also been obvious to combine Hayashi with Fujita for the benefit of allow the user to click on the control buttons to manipulate the image to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Bunney (U.S. Patent 6,003,032) discloses a data communication system.
- Stern (U.S. Patent 5,896,462) discloses a method for storing and retrieving images in/from a database.
- Nojima (U.S. Publication 2002/0004805 A1) discloses a document processing apparatus for storing and modifying data used effect data.
- Dix discloses adding value to static visualization through simple interaction.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

6. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/11/2005